

Just an image: Godard, cinema, and philosophy

'When you become older, the analysis of the structure is part of the novel itself. It's the difference between James Joyce and Erle Stanley Gardner. In Perry Mason, the mystery is only the mystery of describing [whereas with Joyce] the mystery of the writing itself is part of the novel. The observer and the universe are part of the same universe. It's what science discovered at the beginning of this century, when they say you can't tell where an atomic particle is. You know where they are, but not their speed or you know their place but not their speed, because it depends on you. The one who describes is part of the description.'¹

Godard's films are a metacritical and philosophical analysis of the image, taking as an object of reflection two important hypotheses often expressed in aphoristic fashion. The first hypothesis is that cinema is not a reflection of reality but the reality of a reflection, thus turning on its head traditional conceptions of mimesis and representation. The second hypothesis, also an aphorism and related to the first, is that there is no 'just image', there is only 'just an image'. In this essay, I explore how in his films Godard takes on in broad strokes the question of representation and explores the proposition that reality cannot be understood apart from cultural, political, and social practices or apart from 'the one who describes [and who is] part of the description'. What does it mean to invert the meaning of the image, reducing it to 'just an image'? What is the character of Godard's 'pedagogy' so often alluded to by critics and different from our conventional expectations of the pedagogical? What is the role of history and memory in this pedagogy? And how appropriate is it to adopt the idea of pedagogy to describe Godard's critical/cinematic mode?

James Roy MacBean, in his chapters on Godard in *Film and Revolution*, has written that in Godard's films, 'truth is no longer understood as immanent in things and beings; as if lying there waiting to be revealed (like God's grace: it is nothing more and nothing less than the significations and moral transformations we produce in social practice'.² Can it be, contrary to MacBean, that cinema is more than knowledge produced in social practice?

Do Godard's reflections through cinema on cinema and television offer a commentary on received knowledge and beckon the spectator toward the unthought, toward new ways of thinking about the world as conveyed through visual and sound images?

In his philosophic writings on cinema, Gilles Deleuze offers insights into Godard's filmmaking, on Godard's 'pedagogical' conception of the cinematic image. Deleuze wrote that in the post-World War II cinema: 'The cinema is going to become an analytic of the image, implying a new conception of cutting, a whole "pedagogy" which will operate in different ways.'³ However, this 'pedagogy' to which Deleuze alludes requires careful attention. It is not a polemic or a method for reading 'truth' through the image, since the image is just an image. Godard's pedagogy involves formalism insofar as the spectator must become aware of the image, must regard and understand the image as image and hence as a means of rethinking how cinema relies on perception and memory.

Through mutual work on the part of both the filmmaker and the spectator, Godard's films can through memory and intelligence unveil 'the untruth of truth' (to borrow from Nietzsche) of the image. Deleuze will describe this process as an encounter with the 'powers of the false' that he describes as follows:

Truthful narration is developed organically, according to legal connections in time and space and chronological relations in time. Of course, the elsewhere may be close to the here, and the former to the present. But this variability of place and movements does not call the relations and connections into question. They rather determine its terms or elements, so that narration implies an inquiry and testimonies which connect it to the true ... Falsifying narration, by contrast frees itself from this system ... The point is that the elements themselves are constantly changing with the relations of time into which they enter, and the terms of their connections ... The power of the false exists only from the perspective of a series of powers, always referring to each other and passing into one another. So that investigators, witnesses and innocent or guilty heroes will participate in the same power of the false the degrees of which they will embody, at each stage of the narration. Even 'the truthful man ends up realizing that he has never stopped lying' as Nietzsche said.⁴

In other words, Godard's films are not designed to produce an interpretation of the correct meaning of the images that add up to an immutable sense of the real, of truth, and of a comprehensible totality. In Godard's work, the film becomes conceptual; that is, a theory of cinema which is also a philosophy. Again, returning to Deleuze, this

theory of cinema is not 'about' cinema but about the concepts that cinema gives rise to and which are themselves related to other concepts corresponding to other practices ... The great cinema authors are like the great painters or the

great musicians: it is they who talk about what they do. But in talking they become philosophers or theoreticians ... So we must no longer ask ourselves 'what is cinema?' But what is philosophy?⁵

What follows is an examination of the philosophic and poetic character of two films, one a recent film, *For Ever Mozart* (1996), the other an earlier film, *A Married Woman* (1964). In an effort to challenge critical assessments that seek to valorise either the 'early' or the late Godard, and without violating the ongoing changes that characterise Godard's investigations of film on film, I focus on the treatment of the image and on the connections between cinema and philosophy in these two films.

In the press notes for the film, Godard described *For Ever Mozart* as 'four films which do not necessarily form a whole'.⁶ Even more intriguing is his introduction to the film, as '36 Characters in search of History'. This phrase situates the film as one of investigation, of a quest, but more specifically, an investigation of historicising. The spectator is given a number of fragments, of clues that do not add up to a 'whole'. In this film, as in *A Married Woman*, the film's insistence on fragmentation does not disappear but is woven into the film's texture as a means of exploring conceptions of the cinematic image. The fragmented allusions from Marivaux, de Musset, Hugo, Camus, Malraux, Pessoa, and Hemingway are not merely a barrage of literary quotations; they are aligned to pressing and unresolved conceptions of history, of difference and repetition, that the film investigates. The disjoining of sound and visual image, the doubling of characters and motifs, the proliferation of voices on the sound track, the ambiguity of beginnings and endings, the juxtaposition of the Spanish Civil War and the war in Bosnia, are instrumental in challenging conventional visual and historical representation as exemplified by contemporary commercial cinema (e.g. *Schindler's List*).

In writing about Godard's *King Lear*, Tim Murray has persuasively argued that narrative disjunction, fragmentation, false continuity, and the de-linking of sound and image are indicative of how Godard's 'quest differs from the confident recreation of authorial vision, artistic harmony and narrative development'.⁷ In its use of disconnected images and elliptical narration, the film seeks to subvert and invite reflection on the unifying strategies of conventional narration as derived from the pre-World War II cinemas. Godard's pedagogical treatment in relation to his theory of cinema involves an examination of images derived from other arts, other discursive modes, and from other times. While these strategies place the spectator on a less familiar terrain than classical cinema, his 'fragments of a film' are much more than a ruse to confound and render the film superior to its audience.

His films are consistently investigations, using certain characters as “‘a kind of viewer” in a situation that outstrips his motor capacities on all sides, and makes him hear or see what is no longer subject to the rules of a response or an action. He records rather than reacts’.⁸ In *For Ever Mozart*, and *A Married Woman*, the character as a viewer is engaged in investigating the physical body, the body of time, and the body of thought. The youthful body, the woman’s body, the ageing body, the bodies of the actors, the tortured and raped body of the woman, the body of the filmmaker, and the body of film – constitute the arena of investigation, but in the sense that the body is not in opposition to a ‘cinema of the brain’. The relations between body and brain are complementary: ‘the brain gives orders to the body which is just an outgrowth of it, but the body also gives orders to the brain which is just a part of it’.⁹ The fragments in these two films are not waiting to be unified: instead they are an invitation to confront how the brain works in relation to the body. In many of Godard’s films, the recurrence of constantly shifting images of the sky is an invitation to think about the cinematic image. Godard, in an interview with Colin MacCabe, described cinematic projection as ‘like looking at the sky’, the big image, not the little TV image.¹⁰

Godard’s insistence on the cinematic and philosophic importance of recognising fragmentation is central to *A Married Woman*, entitled ‘Fragments of a film made in 1964’.¹¹ The film is a collection of fragments that stubbornly resist a tidy synthesis. From the first lovemaking scenes to the last, the spectator is treated to discrete bodily images, particularly of Charlotte – hands, legs, breast, torso, and face. Charlotte’s fragmentation into bodily parts is comparable to the advertisements and posters she sees (as do we). But not only is her body fragmented, her thoughts too are presented as fragments in the voice-over. As MacCabe and Mulvey write in their book on Godard, ‘This lack of a coherent view enables the film to break down a unified image of woman’s body held in a man’s look [or in a woman’s] and to provide instead a series of disconnected images which resist attempts at unification’.¹² This fragmentation of the woman’s body can be analogised to the body of cinema that appears unified but is in effect an assemblage of fragments.

In *For Ever Mozart*, the cinematic body is similarly severed, as are the bodies of Camille, Jérôme and Djamila, this time in the context of the Bosnian war. Moreover, this war is not considered in isolation but juxtaposed to the 1936 Civil War in Spain, introducing the ubiquitous reminders in Godard’s films of war and atrocity (Auschwitz in *A Married Woman*). In Godard’s cinematic palimpsest in *For Ever Mozart*, war is also associated with television (the references to CNN) and cinema, and with

money (the failed effort to get an audience for *The Fatal Bolero*). War extends beyond the terrain of the battlefield, necessitating a different understanding of history, time, of fact and fiction, art and politics, and antagonistic relations between the nation and the State. The quixotic undertaking of the three young people, Camille, Jérôme, and Djamila, in their quest to bring culture to warring Sarajevo introduces complex questions about the meaning, status, and role of culture and simultaneously about cinema, particularly its potential for revealing or concealing 'reality'.¹³

Both *A Married Woman* and *For Ever Mozart* involve theatre and theatricality. In the opening sequences of *A Married Woman*, Robert, an actor, speaks of the theatre through the words of Bossuet, a seventeenth-century theologian, who regarded the drama as encouraging flattering fantasies based on lust. In contrast to this position, Robert states Molière's dictum that the 'theatre prevents sin by purifying love'. Why is Molière invoked; what is being negotiated on the part of the film in relation to melodrama? In *For Ever Mozart*, the trio of young people intends to mount a production of de Musset's play, *One Must Not Play at Love*, in Sarajevo (a reminder of the Spanish Civil War and also of youthful opposition against the War in Vietnam, another civil war). In the light of Godard's pedagogy, in his provocative stance toward his audience, (1) are we being treated to an instance of repetition and cliché concerning fantasy and desire exemplified by youthful romance, idealism, and rebellion? (2) Is the film an investigation of the 'theatricality' that haunts cinema? In both *A Married Woman* and *For Ever Mozart*, the theatre is never confined to the stage, but becomes rather another way in which fiction and fact are alloyed.

In both earlier and later Godard films, music, particularly classical music, is integral to the films – not merely as 'background'. Beethoven quartets are heard throughout *A Married Woman*, in relation to the lovemaking in particular. However, there is not a one-to-one correspondence between visual image and sound image; they function as counterpoint and, as such, provoke a number of associations concerning character, landscape, memory, and event. In *For Ever Mozart*, the allusion to Ravel's *Bolero* as 'fatal' carries one of the film's important questions: 'Is the history of Europe in the 1990s a simple rehearsal with slight symphonic variation of the chaos and cowardice of the 1930s ... a dreadful unending *Bolero* by Ravel?' The invocation of the Ravel piece as an exemplary musical instance of repetition with 'slight variation' offers one version of art that remains bound to the limited and confined: the endless conflict between the machinic and the chaotic, suggesting a certain determinism and inevitability. Mozart's music however is tied, like the image of the sky in the film, to a form of dreaming or imagination that cinema can evoke, suggesting a vision of difference, of

constant movement and of playfulness. In the context of music, Mozart (and the young man dressed as Mozart) in the film provides a contrast to the crass forms of filmmaking that one segment of the film dramatises. The film ends with an image of his musical script, signifying the necessity of turning the page and of movement rather than stasis and closure – all attributes of Godard's conception of the cinematic image.

Of music, Godard has said, 'three quarters of my films could do without music'. They are 'sounds that have the value of images. I have never used music otherwise'.¹⁴ He added, 'I conceive my films from my own world of cinema ... For me music is a living element, just like a street or cars. It is something I describe preexistent to the film'. Another way to understand the role of the music and other theatrical or novelistic elements can be discerned from the following observations by Godard that invite reflection on his notion of image as extending beyond the visual.

Basically I put everything into a film ... For me to describe modern life is to observe mutations, and not simply to describe ... Basically, what I am doing is making the spectator share the arbitrary nature of my choices, and the quest for general rules ... In other words, it isn't a film, it's an attempt at a film and presented as such.¹⁵

These images of 'mutations' are profoundly related to Godard's treatment of the relationship of fact and fiction. The categories of fact and fiction, subjective and objective, and real and imaginary are in his films not discrete but mingled. In Godard's films, these conventional binaries are subject to examination so as to reveal their interdependency in ways characteristic of post-World War II cinema, the cinema of the 'time-image'. In his description of the time-image characteristic of postwar cinema, and its relation to questions of subjectivity and objectivity, Deleuze has written:

As for the distinction between subjective and objective, it ... tends to lose its importance ... We run into a principle of indeterminability, of indiscernibility: we no longer know what is imaginary or real, physical nor mental, in the situation, not because they are confused, but because we do not have to know and there is no longer a place from which to ask. It is as if the real and imaginary were running after each other, as if each was being reflected in the other, around a point of indiscernibility ... The imaginary and real become indiscernible.¹⁶

The blurring of the lines between the 'imaginary' and the 'real' is evident throughout *A Married Woman*. The 'story' of Charlotte's marriage and her extramarital affair is dramatised through cinematic forms associated with documentary, especially *cinéma vérité*, interviews, monologues, titles, and random episodes on the street. What is subjective and objective? What is the

character of the 'real' and of 'truth'? In describing *A Married Woman*, Godard once said: 'Woe unto me ... since I have just made *La femme mariée*, a film where subjects are seen as objects, where pursuits by taxi alternate with ethnological interviews, where the spectacle of life mingles with its analysis: a film, in short, where cinema plays happily delighted only to be what it is'.¹⁷ James Monaco, commenting on Godard's observations on the blurring of fact and fiction especially in relation to this film, wrote that 'We are finally freed from the conventions of fiction in general and genres in particular, and we can now accept each juxtaposition for what it is'.¹⁸ And, he adds, Godard can now speak 'in his own voice'.¹⁹

But what is it that is freed through the abrogation of these fictional and generic conventions? To answer this question, we return to the Nietzschean 'truth of untruth, the honest person's discovery that she lies'. Refining on the nature of 'untruth', Godard once asserted that

A distinction is usually drawn between Lumière and Méliès. Lumière, they say, is documentary, and Méliès is fantasy. But today what do we see when we watch their films? We see Méliès filming the reception of the King of Yugoslavia by the President of the Republic. A newsreel in other words. And at the same time we find Lumière filming a family card game in the *Bouvard et Pécuchet* manner. In other words, fiction. Let us be more precise and say that what interested Méliès was the ordinary in the extraordinary; and Lumière, the extraordinary in the ordinary.²⁰

Continuing in this vein, Godard has said, 'You can start with fiction or documentary. But whichever you start with you will inevitably find the other.'²¹

This contamination of fact with fiction is brilliantly illustrated in *A Married Woman* in the scenes of Charlotte with both Pierre and Robert, where she pursues questions about authenticity and lying, playing a role and being sincere. To Pierre, she poses the question, 'what are your faults?' And he responds 'pride'. She confesses that hers is 'laziness in will power'. Yet the encounters between the two, the *mise-en-scène*, her 'curiosity', and his evasiveness also dramatise the 'truth' of marriage in the 'fictions' that constitute 'love and fidelity' exemplified in such clichés as Pierre's 'What did you do today?' In this banal mode of presentation the film has indicated how the ordinary event punctures the fictions of romance. The ostensible claims of 'l'amour' are exposed as banal and ordinary though often raised in popular cinema to the level of theatricality or melodrama.

More cogently, in the final episodes where Charlotte interviews Robert about theatricality and authenticity, fiction and fact inevitably contaminate each other through a comic treatment of a usually melodramatic dilemma – the parting of lovers. Charlotte's question to Robert about who he 'really is'

provokes a common-sense response on his part: he responds that he is just like 'any other self'. However, she persists by reminding him that he is an actor and thus asks him what is an actor? Again in ostensibly self-evident terms, Robert patiently explains that as an actor he plays a part as an 'interpreter' of something; he creates a character. As in a Socratic dialogue, Charlotte, as the *eiron*, asks him whether he is playing a part at the present time, urging him to distinguish between acting and being. And as a naïve informant, or as an *alazon*, he claims that there is a difference between acting and life, the difference being that in life he 'relies on his own script'. Furthermore, their reading from the farewell scene from Racine's *Bérénice* underscores the classical distinction between life and art, between romance and realism as they play out their separation though a different conception of theatre that invokes theatre but is not theatrical; that is, not melodramatic. In relation to 'endings', the audience is left merely with the blunt statement, 'Yes, it's over'. Their affair was, after all, the creation of the film and not of destiny or fate. Thus, the conventional investment in the fantasies of cinema in their representations of eternal love, passion, and sincerity are dealt a blow.

In *For Ever Mozart*, theatricality, while also present, has more sinister, less playful implications. Not only do we have the young people in a clichéd 'theatre of war', finally acting out not a romantic comedy but a brutal scenario, their romance with life and politics ending in death. Throughout the film the lines quoted from the de Musset play take on ominous tones as events become more horrific. The audience is treated to another aspect of Godard's preoccupation, that of language and especially of cliché, where conventional notions of representation, particularly its self-evident character, present themselves as an obstacle to critical thought. For example, one character says, 'War is easy. It's sticking a piece of metal into a piece of flesh'. Or at another point a character says, 'Happiness is such a rare pearl', and when Djamila describes death, she asserts, 'It's not like in books. They use nice sentences but it's not like that'. Moreover the film's mixture of tragedy and comedy is consistent in Godard's films that seek to break down all categories so as to challenge much theatricality as cliché but as cliché that has dire consequences.

Even philosophical phrases take on the aura of clichés, as in a conversation about Descartes's, 'I think, therefore I am' that gets converted to 'I think, I am', since the 'I' of 'I think' is not the same as the 'I' of 'I am'. More brutal and familiar clichés drawn from numerous documentaries and fiction films are obvious during the conversation between the Red Cross worker and his aide and the commandant of the 'camp'. The visitors are told, 'there are no prisoners,' though they fail to add the reason, namely that

enemies are quickly eliminated. In the same scene, a bored soldier is told by the commandant to 'go out and shoot his load', whereupon he exits and the sound of a machine is heard.

The uses of cliché are a measure of the film's cinematic self-consciousness, of the breakdown of sensory-motor responses characteristic of the movement-image. By contrast, the cinema of the time-image introduces a 'world without totality or linkage ... floating images ... anonymous clichés which circulate in the external world, but which also penetrate each of us, so that everyone possesses only psychic clichés by which he thinks or feels'.²² The theatre and the cinema become a cliché and Godard (like Deleuze) seeks ways through the image to challenge cliché. In revealing this world without totality or linkage, Godard adopts witty and humorous devices to unmask cliché; foremost is his treatment of language, visual and verbal. In *A Married Woman*, the word 'danger' embeds the word 'ange' (angel) and 'rêves' (dreams) the name 'Eve'. In *For Ever Mozart*, even the title indulges in word play. 'Il faut rêver Mozart' in English becomes 'For Ever Mozart' whereas in French 'It is necessary to Dream Mozart'. And, 'The International Brigade' from the Spanish Civil war becomes in the context of Bosnia 'The International Brigands'. *L'Espoir* (Hope), the title of the Malraux book on Spain and also of the documentary film, gets changed in the context of the Bosnian war to 'expectation'. The references to writers and to quotations and to titles from their works recalls the many times that Godard has presented the words as signs and exposed their contradictory signification. And in the case of 're-garding' words, like regarding images, the audience is reminded in the film that 'regarder' means to 'look twice'. In effect, the word 'regard' in Godard's cinema is an invitation to 'look twice'. He traps the spectator in every imaginable way into re-garding what is seen and thus challenging the naturalised and inattentive modes often inherent to conventional cinema.

The most important linkage between *A Married Woman* and *For Ever Mozart* concerns Godard's critical animadversions (indebted to André Bazin) on the character of cinema and temporality in the monologues delivered by Pierre, Charlotte, Leenhardt, and Nicholas. Each is introduced as in a documentary (or a silent film) by intertitles appropriate to the subject discussed. Pierre delivers his views on memory, somewhat pompously but in ways nonetheless germane to questions of cinema. Bazin in seeking to answer the question 'What is cinema?' had written about the role of memory in perception, deriving his views, as did Deleuze later, from Henri Bergson's *Matter and Memory*. In his 'The Ontology of the Photographic Image', placing importance on the role of memory and time, Bazin asserted that:

No one believes any longer in the ontological identity of model and image, but all are agreed that the image helps us to remember the subject and to preserve him from a second spiritual death. Today the making of images no longer shares an anthropocentric, utilitarian purpose. It is no longer a question of survival after death, but of a larger concept, the creation of an ideal world in the likeness of the real, with its own temporal destiny.²³

Similarly *A Married Woman* invokes questions of memory as part of its investigations 'about cinema' and temporality. However, it is not memory alone that haunts the films but its relation to time and intelligence. An examination of the 'mummification' of the image is central to the film. Pierre's monologue introduces the importance of memory but also reveals the limitations of separating memory from thinking. He asserts the importance of memory for him at the same time that he displays his own forgetfulness in relation to Charlotte. He takes as his subject of memory not his own situation but the memory of Auschwitz by commenting that at the trial the Germans couldn't 'remember a thing'.

The spectator is reminded not merely of the Holocaust but of the question raised at the end of Resnais's *Night and Fog*, the question of 'Who is responsible' as each German reiterates the assertion 'je ne suis pas coupable'. Resnais's question, like that of Godard's through Pierre, is not legalistic but an invitation to rethink questions of responsibility in relation to past and present. The question of responsibility is also raised quite explicitly in a telephone monologue in *For Ever Mozart* where the character asks, 'Isn't all excess of evil worse than an absence of good? One is never totally innocent of what one can prevent, but one is totally guilty only of what one does'.

This rethinking of the past in *A Married Woman* is complicated by invoking the figure of a 'Mr Rossellini' and the grotesqueries of a commemorative march by deportees ten years after their expatriation. Pierre asserts that the marchers were now fat and prosperous, different from their appearance and situation a decade ago, concluding that they 'did not remember that they had changed'. However, this monologue, as one might expect, captures another aspect of memory that involves other filmmakers and their struggling with cinematic history and memory. Pierre's monologue reveals the various levels and depths of Godard's uses of memory that seem almost random, sly, and not at all monumental and inflated. Could Pierre's Mr Rossellini be an invocation of the filmmaker and of the film's forging of connections between his film and Italian postwar filmmaking and particularly of Roberto Rossellini's role as 'father' of the French New Wave? This allusion is not a matter of citation but an acknowledgement of the critical importance of the films that preceded and also shaped the style and critical preoccupations of the French New Wave, and of Godard in

particular. I am thinking especially of the frequent interviews with Rossellini by *Cahiers du cinéma*²⁴ and reviews of his films. In the 1940s, *Roma, città aperta* and *Paisà* in particular, and also *Germania anni zero*, offered different treatments of war and fascism.

These films focused on the need to trace remnants of the past in the present so as to consider monolithic and 'mummified' forms of existing cinematic presentations, particularly as these have been responsible for perpetuating frozen and reductive presentations of history. Rossellini's investigations did not remain bound to the 'aesthetics of neorealism' as institutionalised and codified on the part of Italian critics and reviewers. In such films as *Stromboli*, *Francesco, guillare di dio*, *Europa*, *Il Miracolo* and *Una voce umana*, Rossellini's films increasingly turned to an examination of cinematic language – image, narrative, sound and silence, encouraging the viewer to rethink inherited clichés. Of the pedagogical role of cinema, Rossellini stated that:

in order to reconstruct the world it's necessary to revise the basis of education, which is too aimed at inculcating ready-made truths, instead of giving everyone a means of discovering these truths. Henceforth the sole means to put intellectual and human progress to the test is to know, to be made aware, to understand. The quickest method, the most immediate and accessible today is the image.²⁵

As 'father of the New Wave' (explicitly dubbed as such by François Truffaut), Rossellini moved beyond the confines of the 'movement-image', invoking images of the past not as nostalgia but as a means for remembering what has been forgotten, buried under the debris of cliché, habit, and representation. In his work, notions of realism and of *vérité* are not matters of form and style but touch profoundly on the effects of fascism and the need to produce a critique of knowledge as derived (or embalmed) through cinema. Rossellini, in terms that apply to Godard's methods, has said that his quest has been to rediscover

an art – an art that has been completely corrupted, that has dissolved in abstraction, that has made us forget how not to use just language but the very alphabet on which language rests, and once we have established it, to make sure that each word regains its meaning, its value, and becomes again the fruit of some profound thought, so that language may be again a real language and not just a collection of labels stuck on samples of things of which we barely know the existence.²⁶

'The function of the artist', he added later in the same *Cahiers* interview, is 'to conquer things, to find the new language.'²⁷ In assessing his contribution to the New Wave (and perhaps to cinema more broadly, Rossellini found

that it lay in his 'stressing again and again that above all they must not regard cinema as something mystical. Film is a means of expression like any other. Films have to be made as simply as writing with a pen.'²⁸ The relevance of Pierre's reference to Rossellini is multidimensional. It is an exercise in how attentive memory can be triggered by a seemingly casual reference. It also invokes other connections, particularly the role of neo-realism as a catalyst for rethinking possibilities for postwar cinema as these involve the role of the filmmaker and his or her attitudes toward language and the uses of the past. It also becomes an explicit or indirect engagement with cinema across transnational lines, signalling that cinema, for good or ill, is no longer national.

Remembering Rossellini remembering is thus another aspect of Godard's pedagogy. In *For Ever Mozart*, the audience is shown the desk where Rossellini wrote his *Pulcinella*. Beyond the other associations with Rossellini cited above, Godard considers the Italian director to be one of the rare cineastes (Fellini's *La Strada* is also alluded to) that were part of a national cinematic tradition. In *For Ever Mozart*, the reference to Rossellini's work also invokes the commedia dell'arte (also associated with Marivaux). In Godard's as in Rossellini's films, we are given the portrait of another failed revolution, a journey of actors, comedians on the run, and a 'parable of Rossellini's intellectual and moral journey'.²⁹ *For Ever Mozart* is compounded of memories of the Spanish Civil War, Viet Nam, *La Strada*, *Pulcinella*, *She Wore a Yellow Ribbon*, Mozart's Salzburg, and many of Godard's earlier films.

The concern with memory in both Godard films is also derived from Bazin and the Cahiers group insofar as they saw themselves in opposition to positivism. They saw the experience of cinema as 'more profound than mere understanding',³⁰ placing particular emphasis on Henri Bergson's distinction in relation to memory between 'two kinds of recognition', automatic or habitual, and attentive. Of this distinction, Bergson wrote:

if the idea is to live, it must touch reality on some side, that is to say, it must be able, from step to step, and by progressive diminutions or contractions of itself, to be more or less acted by the body at the same time that it is thought by the mind. Our body, with the sensations it receives on the one hand, is then that which fixes our mind, and gives it ballast and poise. The activity of the mind goes far beyond the mass of accumulated memories, as this mass of memories itself is infinitely more than the sensations and movements of the present hour, but these sensations and these movements condition what we may term our attention to life, and that is why everything depends on their cohesion in the normal work of the mind ...³¹

The image passes through different 'circuits', thus creating ever-widening planes of recollection, and this is where the relations of past to present are

crucial. However, Bergson emphasises the importance of the present to qualify any understanding of connections between past and present and their relation to action. Thus, Charlotte's monologue, in seeming contrast, invokes the present:

Memory ... You don't need it. I prefer the present ... To me the most important thing is to understand what's happening to me ... and to understand what's happening I try to compare it to things I know, that I've seen before ... That's difficult in the present, that's why I like the present, because in 'the present' I have no time to think ... No, I don't understand ... I can't understand the present, it's beyond me. What I like of course is the thing that escapes me – that I can't control the present ...

Charlotte, while emphasising the difficulty of understanding in the present, nonetheless shows that the present involves a form of memory, one that eludes her. However, placed in juxtaposition to Pierre's insistence on the importance of memory, and also in the context of the fragmentary and contradictory character of the two monologues, both monologues evoke Bergson's comments on the relation between memory and the present when he asserts:

To live only in the present, to respond to a stimulus by the immediate action that prolongs it, is the mark of the lower animals: the man who proceeds in this way is a man of *impulse*. But he who lives in the past for the mere pleasure of living there, and in whom recollections emerge in the light of consciousness without any advantage for the present situation, is hardly better fitted for action: here we have no man of impulse, but a *dreamer*. Between these two extremes lives the happy disposition of memory docile enough to follow with precision all the outlines of the present situation, but energetic enough to resist all other appeal. Good sense or practical sense is probably nothing but this.³²

Charlotte's fragmented thoughts in the voice-over are an instance of how the film dramatises constraints on action and understanding in the present while still emphasising its pedagogical value.

Charlotte's quest for understanding in the present despite her assertion of the 'difficulty' is dramatised in her serio-comic 'interview' with the gynaecologist. She interrogates him on conception, pregnancy, and paternity, and particularly on the connection between pleasure and lovemaking, but he is unable to answer her questions. After providing clichés, he is finally reduced to silence, but the spectator is aware of the unanswered questions and of the role of habitual responses, of common sense, in inhibiting thought.

In her elusiveness, Charlotte is the character most identified with cinema. Despite her disavowal of memory, she is constantly seeking to recollect films, as, for example, when she questions Robert about the name of a film

involving a sailor and a young woman. What she specifically recalls of this film is not the 'story' but that a moving camera films the scenes. She is the one most involved with media images and she is the one who assumes 'the ideal position of the spectator in cinema' as she slouches in Robert's car. And in the final episodes in the film, we see her gazing at a poster of Alfred Hitchcock accompanied by music that evokes the memory of Bernard Hermann's soundtracks. In other words, Charlotte in her many permutations invokes the film's investigations of time, memory, and the ephemeral character of the present to cinema.

The role of Roger Leenhardt, himself a prominent film critic and filmmaker, friend of André Bazin, further complicates and expands the investigation of memory and cinema, adding the element of intelligence that unites memory, thought, and action. In his monologue entitled 'Intelligence', he recollects a motto from a young man of the Resistance in the 1940s, named Emmanuel (a Jewish name that links to other references to the war): 'Understand before you act'. This motto constitutes for him the best definition of intelligence, for it constitutes

a search, to reach the depths, the heights, to understand others, to find a small bridge between oneself and the other, between pro and con. Not everybody cares for this intellectual approach. Especially nowadays when things are either black or white, and seeking shadings seems a bit gray. But to me, it's the fanatics who are boring; you always know what they are going to say ... But people who like paradox are fun. Paradox offers an alternative to the self-evident. And then there is compromise, the finest, most courageous of intellectual acts ... it's come to mean lack of conviction. Still I'll go on looking for the proper synthesis and I insist the world isn't totally absurd. And intelligence is precisely the attempt to inject a little reason into this absurdity.

His words could have been uttered as well by Bazin or by Rossellini and are also applicable to *For Ever Mozart*; however, they are not the final truth concerning the past and the present or, for that matter, of intelligence, but they do constitute a critique of habit and common sense. In particular, they focus on the iconoclastic dimension of cinema itself in its challenging of binary thought and in its emphasis on the element of pleasure in relation to intellect. *For Ever Mozart* also invokes intelligence, in relation to Pessoa and *The Outline for Faust*. Through alluding to these works, the film invokes the issue of the defeat of intelligence in yet another war, that of intelligence against itself, against other intelligences, and against action. In *For Ever Mozart* more than in *A Married Woman*, intelligence, and particularly reason, seem to be subject to suspicion and more aligned to poetry than formal philosophy. As Djamilia says to Jérôme: 'I understand Alfred de Musset. But

all this talk about philosophy, what's that?' In Godard, philosophising is always invoked but it is, in the final analysis, poetic.

In the final monologue of *A Married Woman*, the child Nicholas introduces the question of action. Since all three of the characters have focused on connections among memory, time, and intellect in relation to action, Nicholas's list addresses action in ways that would be impossible without memory, a sense of the present, and intelligence. Its relevance for cinema (and its humour) resides in its recounting of the pragmatic dimensions of abstract dissertations on time, memory, representation and reason. For example, the spectator learns that Robert and Leenhardt have just returned from the trials of Nazis at Auschwitz, and Leenhardt recounts how when he asked a German why they had killed Jews and barbers, the man responded, 'Why barbers?' Distractedly, Charlotte repeats the German's question. These fragmentary comments once again pose the film's questioning of memory, responsibility, action in relation to the Holocaust and in relation to the efficacy of representation.

In *For Ever Mozart*, the issue of representation is also central but lacks the clarity of the earlier film, tinged as it is with 'sadness' and the burden of time and generational difference, a pervasive affect in the film. Late in the film a voice-over intones, 'The knowledge of the possibility of representation consoles us for being enslaved to life', but shortly thereafter another voice says, 'The knowledge of life consoles us for the fact that representation is a shadow'. In this way, the film challenges conventional notions of realism, ties them to cinematic automatism, but invites the viewer to attentiveness. The film also insinuates, as in *A Married Woman* in relation to the Holocaust, that a critical view of representation is connected to a rethinking of memory, time, and intelligence. *For Ever Mozart* boldly entertains the question 'Why the Fatal Bolero?' Why repetition and forgetfulness? The question in the film is not one of finding a way to 'represent' the Bosnian war; it is, rather, how to find modes for understanding rather than enacting repetition. Through the voice-over, the audience hears,

My master once said, 'I conceive of nothing as infinite'. 'Listen', I said. 'Imagine a space and that beyond this space there is more space and more and more. It's never-ending'. 'Why?', asked my master. I was stupefied. 'If it ends', I shouted, 'what's beyond it?' 'If it ends, beyond it is nothing', he answered.

This parable is balanced by the words of the musical director for the youth orchestra (a scene reminiscent of Fellini's allegorical *Orchestra Rehearsal*) on how to play Mozart's music, 'Build up from nothing, and then come back to nothing'. Nothingness in the film, not an invitation to nihilism, is an

invitation to rethinking time, matter and memory, and 'truth' in relation to beginnings and endings.

Toward the end of *A Married Woman*, Charlotte and Robert watch the opening sequence of *Night and Fog* in the airport cinema. As images of the present reveal the German countryside (in colour), the voice-over intones, 'Even a quiet countryside . . . even a road where cars, people, couples pass, may lead to a concentration camp'. *For Ever Mozart's* questioning of memory and of repetition contends with greater complexity, more competing voices, and more clichés, but both films contend with the complex character of cinema spectatorship, not only stressing the fragile character of memory, but specifically invoking questions concerning the minatory and pedagogical role of cinema in the context of what Deleuze, in his discussion of the films of Hans Jürgen Syberberg and of Godard, has called 'the media effect'.

Syberberg's powerful idea is that *no information, whatever it might be, is sufficient to defeat Hitler*. All the documents could be shown, all the testimonies could be heard, but in vain: what makes information all-powerful (the newspapers, and then the radio, and then television), is its very nullity, its radical ineffectiveness. Information plays on its ineffectiveness in order to establish its power, its very power is to be ineffective, and thereby all the more dangerous. That is why it is necessary to go beyond information to defeat Hitler or turn the image over. Now going beyond information is achieved on two sides at once, towards two questions: *what is the source and what is the addressee?* These are also two questions of the Godardian pedagogy. Informatics replies to neither question, because the source of information is not a piece of information any more than is the person informed. If there is no debasement of information, it is because information is itself a debasement. It is thus necessary to go beyond all the pieces of spoken information: to extract from them a pure speech-act, a creative story-telling which is as it were the obverse side of the dominant myths, of current words and their supporters, an act capable of creating the myth instead of drawing profit and business from it.³³

In his films, Godard questions both who is the source and what is the role of the addressee, using his characters as composite figures to investigate the problematic of representation. In the ways that he films her, Charlotte in *A Married Woman* is not an individual woman but a composite of media creations of woman as well as cinema more generally. The original title of the film was to be the generalised *the* married woman, but the censors insisted that the title be changed to the individualised married woman. Rather than constituting a unified image of woman, Charlotte appears as a collage of body parts in the encounters both with her husband and her lover, who comes to resemble her husband. In the distinct body parts – hands, feet, back, face, and especially breasts, Charlotte's body appears as parts of a factory system waiting to be assembled, and the assemblage is the

production of a commodity known as 'woman' tailored to the consumer market. Her breast is measured against the ideal measurements in a magazine, and the possibility of creating a desirable breast is humorously treated as Madame Raymonde reads to Charlotte about the wonders of the 'Peruvian treatment' and recounts the mechanics of the sexual act.

Not only does Godard present 'the relationship between advertising and the body', he indicates 'how that image functions in relation to the home and to the place of woman as *the* consumer in advanced society'.³⁴ However, for Godard to stop here would have been to say no more than a great deal of the sixties common sense of advertising in relation to woman. In breaking down the image of the woman, Godard also strips the image of eroticism identified with popular cinema; the fetishised breast becomes 'just an image'. The scenes between Charlotte and Robert and Pierre are robbed of any 'passion' associated with the usual cinematic treatment of the female body and the sexual act as 'mysterious' and its sight as productive of desire. In emptying the image of conventional affect, it not only becomes just an image; it becomes linked to the question of value that, like money, becomes obscure. The commodity, the cinematic image and particularly the image of woman as an object of exchange, is a product of labour and an expression of the economic and social relation of producers. What is forgotten or concealed is its social character. In other films (e.g. *British Sounds*), Godard will more explicitly remind us that filmmaking is dependent on the fetishistic, the concrete and also abstract, character of the commodity.

In the case of *A Married Woman*, the film invites the spectator to examine exchange value involving the actual parts of the woman's body in relation to questions of capital and commodification, even fetishisation, through advertising and the cinematic medium. In *For Ever Mozart*, the characters are also both subject and object of the film, and their roles advance the film's pedagogical character. The film itself is ironic as it poses and does not 'answer' the questions it raises. The characters in *For Ever Mozart*, function not

to make us believe the role that the actor is playing ... a certain character, so much as present ... through the words and actions of that character certain issues and problems, which the artist does not pretend to solve and which require our participation ... both directly and after the presentation ... which, far from being a reenacting of something that happened in the past, is only a prelude to the work which, after the film, awaits us.³⁵

In *For Ever Mozart*, the characters' names and their roles, like those in Musset are linked, as in the *commedia dell'arte* or in allegory, to certain traits. Camille is an heiress to the heroine of opera and literature, but also to Camus by lineage. Vitaly, the ageing director, is an ironic image of the

filmmaker. Moreover, the situations in which they find themselves are echoes of other films by Godard, Rossellini, Fellini, John Ford, and Buñuel, among others. The scenes in the gambling casino and before the movie theatre invite critical reflection on the plight of critical cinema (no tits, no sex, no poetry, and no colour), linking issues of pornography and sex to commercial cinema and money. In contrast to *A Married Woman*, the 'media effect' is more advanced since the 1960s. Godard thus continues his investigations of contemporary culture but deepened and darkened by the Bosnian conflict.

In relation to Colin MacCabe's question of Godard's abandoning questions of 'how the Third World could make images of themselves', Godard has said:

I was still utopian at the time, and I don't believe now it can be made on an individual level. The imperialism of television has meant that cinema has to be supported. Movies are not making money in theaters, only in festivals and on TV screens. People prefer to see a little image rather than a projection. A projection is like looking at the sky. It doesn't reveal reality; it shows our fear of watching real life. TV is not showing that every day forty thousand children are dying in the world. But movie-making is still capable of working on such a level.³⁶

A Married Woman and *For Ever Mozart*, like Godard's ongoing work in film and video, offer the audience an opportunity to regard the visual image as no longer divorced from time, technology, money, consumption, and circulation. Remorselessly, his films are iconoclastic, seeking to produce different questions about cinema – its history, its uses of the past, its relation to the other arts, the role of memory, requisite notions of reason and intelligence. His cinema has been an unending battle against the self-evident, the cliché, automatic response, and habit. In describing the nature of Godard's pedagogy, his didacticism, comparing it to that of Rossellini, Deleuze describes it as '[A] conception of history which simultaneously calls up the comic and the dramatic, the extraordinary and the everyday; new types of speech-act and new structurations of space. An "archeological" conception almost in Foucault's sense.'³⁷

*

In a lecture at the Smithsonian Institute in 1969, Henri Langlois, founder of the Cinémathèque Française, concluded his comments by asserting, 'I am not a nationalist: cinema is my country.'³⁸ Not only is Langlois speaking for himself but for a generation of post-World War Two filmmakers in Europe, if not for cinema generally today. Langlois's efforts to create an archive for

cinema, to preserve cinematic documents, was not only an acknowledgement of the importance of cinema as a medium for the twentieth century: it was also an admission of cinema and television's international character and of the force of visualisation on twentieth-century culture and politics. In this context, Jean Luc Godard, under the pseudonym Hans Lucas paid homage to another 'HL', Henri Langlois, saying, 'Without Langlois's gigantic effort, today the cinema would be little more than ... touristic postcards ... One guesses immediately what a revolution this new version of historicity might bring about in the aesthetics of the moving picture.'³⁹ In particular, Godard stresses the international connections among filmmakers (e.g. 'We ... know henceforth that Alain Resnais or Otto Preminger has not made any progress compared to Lumière, Griffith, or Dreyer ... They've done something different.'⁴⁰ Working with the archive of twentieth-century cinema, it is this difference that his films have undertaken to investigate.

In all of his films, early and most recent, Godard, like Langlois, is a 'citizen of cinema' and this citizenship extends beyond the national cinema of France and calls into question narrowly construed conceptions of cinema and nation. Not only do his films, writings, television, and video productions focus on the international, historical, and revolutionary aspects of the moving image in the vein of Langlois and of André Bazin, but they also probe in constantly changing forms the character of cinema – its subjects, styles, and philosophic implications, its transformation of the world through vision and sound. Thus, Langlois's passion for cinema history and Bazin's question 'What is cinema?' are hardly superannuated but form a consistent thread throughout Godard's work. Both *For Ever Mozart* and *A Married Woman* are evidence of his unceasingly analytic and also poetic treatment of the cinema.

Hardly static, these films challenge their spectators to question and rethink inherited and commonsensical conceptions of the world and its representations. His filmmaking in the seventies was a departure from a mode of filmmaking identified with his production and analysis of the image as spectacle.⁴¹ In such films as *La Chinoise*, *British Sounds*, *Pravda*, *Vladimir and Rosa*, *Tout va bien*, still relying on interview, montage of sight and sound, slogans, captions, intertitles, cartoons, slapstick, quotations from other media, Godard undertook to 'make political films politically'.⁴² These films orchestrate conceptions of politics, economics, and ideological analysis in the service of Marxism-Leninism and of the union of theory and practice. This is not to say that his earlier films such as *A Married Woman* were apolitical, but rather that his investigation of cine-politics has assumed more iconoclastic but changing designs on the forms of his films and on his audiences. He has struggled to ground the examination of 'just

an image' in a more concrete, materialist, class-based, and historical context so as to induce critical awareness on the part of the spectator.

If Godard has continued to maintain his critique of the 'just Image', he has not stood still. In the aftermath of the militant politics of the late sixties and seventies, Godard has continued, albeit in different, constantly experimental registers, to confront the pressing issue of the 'society of the spectacle'. If anything, films such as *Sauve qui peut*, *Passion*, *Prénom*, *Carmen*, and *Marie, je vous salue*, *King Lear*, and *Puissance de la parole* still pursue questions of representation, but again with different focuses and energy. First of all, these films offer dizzying references to classical art, painting, music, theatre, sculpture, cinema and also video within the ongoing concern in Godard's work. Godard's films have continued, have even speeded up, his tendency to trace, explore, and analyse the status of the image and the transformations it has undergone in late capitalist society with its increased dissemination of the visual and aural culture of information and spectacle through old and new forms of media. Godard's reflections on history are intrinsic to his investigations of the cinematic image. The *Histoire(s) du cinéma* are a sober reflection on rethinking history proper and cinematic history. According to Jonathan Dronsfield, 'It is a work reviewing the entire spatial-temporal limits of its own presentation by repeating history – which needs must include its own history – as if for the first time, a cinema perpetually remade and permanently provocative ... If there is a sense of something yet to come for Godard it is that we still have to make history.'⁴³

Current cultural and political analysts have reconceptualised the economic and political character of the last decades of the twentieth century under the rubric of 'globalism'. And Godard, through his encyclopaedic knowledge of media and their history and his situating cultural production within international economic and ideological contexts, has pursued his cine-political explorations of the image into the lairs of late capitalism. In *The Geopolitical Aesthetic*, Fredric Jameson identifies the particularly global nature of Godard's more recent work in his discussion of *Passion*. Jameson writes: 'Godard's strategy is to pose the strongest possible objection to the medium – to foreground its most urgent crises, beginning with that of financing itself, omnipresent in these late films and above all here – in order the more triumphantly to surmount them.'⁴⁴

In *Passion*, Godard expands his treatment of the image to include the classical arts and to place them in relation to cinema (in ways reminiscent of certain films of Pier Paolo Pasolini, e.g. *La Ricotta*), and he does this in multi-layered fashion, involving film within a film, the uses of video, scenarios of sexuality and capital, the introduction of tableaux scenes that are pictorial and theatrical, the different uses of classical music working with and against

the cinematic images, the juxtaposition of the everyday with the theatrical, and, finally, the intrusion of his person, not as mere signature or cameo appearance, but as another important element of the filmmaker/auteur's philosophic, psychic, intellectual, and economic investment in production.

Godard's presence in *First Name Carmen* as an unpredictable, hypochondriacal, and even self-parodic figure also introduces an increasingly autobiographical dimension into his films. Wheeler Winston Dixon has also suggested that, while in the mid sixties Godard paid homage to other directors, in this film 'Godard himself has become part of cinema history'.⁴⁵ Through Godard's consistent attention to the 'justness' of an image, his work has sought to free the cinema and its spectators from unthinking forms of automatism. In Deleuze's terms, but paraphrasing Godard: 'It is not a matter of following a chain of images, even across voids, but of getting out of the chain of association. Film ceases to "be images in a chain . . . an uninterrupted chain of images each one the slave of the next," and whose slave we are (*Ici et ailleurs*).'⁴⁶

In Godard, the cinematic image cannot offer 'an illusion of the world' but confronts the impossible task of restoring 'belief in the world'.⁴⁷ In other words, Godard's radical investigation of cinema introduces 'reflection into the image itself'.⁴⁸ However, this reflection into the cinematic (and televisual) image is not mere reference to itself, to the formal features of artistic production, but a larger essay into the conditions of possibility, if any, for a cinema of thought, belief, and action.⁴⁹ Specifically, in relation to questions of time, mutability, and sadness, *For Ever Mozart* has Vitaly say to Camille: 'Perhaps the universe was once young like you and the sky was all ablaze. As the world grew older, it grew farther away. When I look at the sky through the stars, I can only see what has disappeared.'

Notes

- 1 Jean-Luc Godard, *Interviews*, ed. David Sterritt (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 1998), 192.
- 2 James Roy MacBean, *Film and Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 5.
- 3 Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 22.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 133.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 280.
- 6 David Stratton, 'For Ever Mozart', *Variety*, 16 September 1996, p. 70.
- 7 Tim Murray, 'The Crisis of Cinema in the Age of the New World Memory', *The Cinema Alone: Essays on the Work of Jean-Luc Godard 1985–2000* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 174.
- 8 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 3.

- 9 Ibid., 103.
- 10 Duncan Petrie (ed.), *Screening Europe* (London: BFI, 1992), 100.
- 11 Tom Milne, 'Jean-Luc Godard ou la Raison Ardente', *Focus on Godard*, ed. Royal S. Brown (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 123–35.
- 12 Colin MacCabe and Laura Mulvey, *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), 35.
- 13 Petrie, *Screening Europe*, 100.
- 14 Tom Milne (ed. and trans.), *Godard on Godard* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1986), 233.
- 15 Ibid., 234–5.
- 16 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 7.
- 17 James Monaco, *The New Wave: Truffaut, Godard, Chabrol, Rohmer, Rivette* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 147.
- 18 Ibid., 147.
- 19 Ibid., 148.
- 20 Milne, *Godard on Godard*, 235.
- 21 MacBean, *Film and Revolution*, 91.
- 22 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 171–2.
- 23 André Bazin, *What Is Cinema*, trans. Hugh Gray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 10.
- 24 Jim Hillier (ed.), *Cahiers du Cinéma: The 1950s, Neorealism, Hollywood, New Wave* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985).
- 25 Tag Gallagher, *The Adventures of Roberto Rossellini: His Life and Films* (New York: Da Capo, 1998), 582.
- 26 Roberto Rossellini, *My Method: Writings and Interviews*, trans. Annapaola Cancogni (New York: Marsilio, 1992), 140.
- 27 Ibid., 149.
- 28 Ibid., 163.
- 29 Gallagher, *The Adventures of Roberto Rossellini*, 542–3.
- 30 Ibid., 430.
- 31 Henri Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, trans. Nancy Margaret Paul (New York: Zone Books, 1991), 173.
- 32 Ibid., 153.
- 33 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 270.
- 34 MacCabe and Mulvey, *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics*, 92.
- 35 Macbean, *Film and Revolution*, 77.
- 36 Petrie, *Screening Europe*, 100.
- 37 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 248.
- 38 Glenn Myrent and Georges P. Langlois, *Henry Langlois: First Citizen of Cinema*, trans. Lisa Nesselson (New York: Twayne, 1995), 176.
- 39 Ibid., 177.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Macbean, *Film and Revolution*, 45.
- 42 Guy Austin, *Contemporary French Cinema: An Introduction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 19.
- 43 Jonathan Dronsfield, 'The Present Never Exists There', 'The Temporality of Decision in Godard's Later Film and Video Essays', in *The Cinema Alone: Essays on the Work of Jean-Luc Godard, 1985–2000*, ed. Michael Temple and James S. Williams (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 64.

- 44 Fredric Jameson, *The Geopolitical Aesthetic: Cinema and Space in the World System* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 159.
- 45 Wheeler Winston Dixon, *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard* (New York: State University of New York, 1997), 153.
- 46 Deleuze, *Cinema 2*, 180.
- 47 Ibid., 181–2.
- 48 Ibid., 186.
- 49 For a critique of ‘political modernism’, see D. N. Rodowick, *The Crisis of Political Modernism: Criticism and Ideology in Contemporary Film Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 43.